



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,591	09/27/2004	Michael Burr	2006579-0272 (CTX-093DV)	5590
69665 7590 03/13/2009 CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC. TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110			EXAMINER NICKERSON, JEFFREY L	
			ART UNIT 2442	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/13/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/711,591	Applicant(s) BURR ET AL.	
	Examiner JEFFREY NICKERSON	Art Unit 2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Application No. 10/711,591 filed on 27 September 2004 as a divisional of Application No. 10/711,583 filed on 27 September 2004. The amendment presented on 06 January 2009, which provides change to claims 1, 5-6, 8-9, 11, 13, 16, 21, 23-24, and 28, and provides change to the specification, is hereby acknowledged. Claims 1-30 have been examined.

Specification

2. The amendment filed 06 January 2009 providing change to the specification is noted. All prior objections to the specification are therefore obviated and hereby withdrawn.

Claim Objections

3. The amendment filed 06 January 2009 providing change to claims 1 and 16 is noted. All prior objections to the claims are therefore obviated and hereby withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 06 January 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Independent claims 1 and 16

Art Unit: 2442

Applicant argues the combined teachings of Microsoft Windows Server 2000/2003, ISA Server 2000/2004, and LinuxQuestions do not teach a limitation found within these claims. Specifically, applicant argues the combined teachings do not teach assigning a virtual host name to a user.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. WindowsServer2000 provides for assigning a virtual identifier to a user (Microsoft01: pgs 1-2 describes assigning an internal/private IP to a VPN client/user via DHCP). ISAServer2000 provides for wherein the identifier is a host name (ISA01: pg 1). Thus, the combined teachings provide for assigning a virtual host name to a user.

Applicant's arguments are ultimately unpersuasive and, therefore, the rejections of these claims are hereby maintained.

Dependent claims 2-15 and 17-30

Applicant argues these claims conditionally on the arguments of their parent, independent claims.

Applicant's arguments are ultimately unpersuasive and, therefore, the rejections of these claims are hereby maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2442

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1-6 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the public use of the products Microsoft Windows 2000/2003 Server, as evidenced by Microsoft01 ("Remote Access VPN Connections", 19 January 2000); and in further view of the public use of the products ISA Server 2000/2004, as evidenced by ISA01 ("Common DNS Issues in VPN Networking", 07 April 2004); and LinuxQuestions ("Multiple Simultaneous VPN Connections?").

Regarding claim 1, Windows2000Server teaches a method for providing a uniform network address, for a user accessing a computer on a network, independent of the computer the user is accessing, the method comprising:

obtaining a plurality of virtual identifiers, each of the plurality of virtual identifiers comprising an identifier uniquely identifying a user from a plurality of users (Microsoft01: pg 1, specifies internal/private address for VPN use; pg 3, last paragraph specifies using DHCP for internal/private IPs);

assigning, from a plurality of virtual identifiers, a first virtual identifier to a first user (VPN client connection) accessing the network via a first computer, the first computer having a computer IP address to connect to the network (Microsoft01: pgs 1-2 specify VPN basics such as public IPs and private IPs; pg 3, last paragraph specifies DHCP use);

Art Unit: 2442

using the first virtual identifier assigned to the first user for network communications of the first user (Microsoft01: pgs 1-2).

Windows2000Server does not teach:

wherein the virtual identifier is a host name;

associating the first virtual host name of the first user with a first IP address, the first IP address communicated via the first computer;

performing the above for a second user accessing the network via the same computer.

ISAServer2000, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the virtual identifier is a host name (ISA01: pg 1);

associating the first virtual host name of the first user with a first IP address, the first IP address communicated via the first computer (ISA01: pg 1-2 provides for VPN clients having an internal DNS host name).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of ISAServer2000 for using DNS in a VPN environment. The teachings of ISAServer2000, when implemented in the Windows2000Server system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to use hostnames in a VPN environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of ISAServer2000 in the Windows2000Server system in order to use hostnames in the VPN environment.

The Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000 system does not teach performing the above for a second user accessing the network via the same computer.

LinuxQuestions, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches it is possible to have more than one simultaneous VPN connection running from the same VPN client computer. Thus, LinuxQuestions teaches performing the above for a second user accessing the network via the same computer (LinuxQuestions: pgs 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of LinuxQuestions for starting multiple simultaneous VPN connections from a single computer. The teachings of LinuxQuestions, when implemented in the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000 system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to create simultaneous VPN connections from a single client machine, each connection having a unique internal IP and hostname. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of LinuxQuestions in the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000 system in order to allow a multiple users to VPN from a single computer.

Regarding claim 2, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches wherein step (a) further comprises obtaining a plurality of IP addresses for assigning unique IP addresses to each of the first user and the second user (Microsoft01: pgs 1-3 provide DHCP is possible for assigning internal IPs to VPN client connections).

Regarding claim 3, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches wherein step (a) further comprises obtaining at least one of the plurality of IP

Art Unit: 2442

addresses from a DHCP server (Microsoft01: pgs 1-3 provide DHCP is possible for assigning internal IPs to VPN client connections).

Regarding claim 4, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches wherein step (a) further comprises reserving at least one of the plurality of IP addresses for at least one of the first user and second user (Microsoft01: pgs 1-3 provide DHCP is possible for assigning internal IPs to VPN client connections).

Regarding claim 5, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches wherein step (d) further comprises associating the first IP address with the first virtual host name (ISA01: pgs 1-5 provide for DNS hostname mapping in a VPN environment).

Regarding claim 6, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches wherein step (c) further comprises associating the second IP address with the second virtual host name (ISA01: pgs 1-5 provide for DNS hostname mapping in a VPN environment).

Regarding claims 16-17, these system claims correspond to the method claims 1-2, respectively, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Art Unit: 2442

Regarding claim 18, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches wherein the server assigns, from the plurality of IP addresses, a first IP address for the first user, and a second IP address, different from the first IP address, for the second user (Microsoft01: pgs 1-3 provides DHCP use, which will provide non-leased IPs).

Regarding claims 19-21, these system claims correspond to method claims 3-5, respectively, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

7. Claims 7-9, 14-15, 22-24, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the public use of the products Microsoft Windows 2000/2003 Server, as evidenced by Microsoft01 ("Remote Access VPN Connections", 19 January 2000); in view of the public use of the products ISA Server 2000/2004, as evidenced by ISA01 ("Common DNS Issues in VPN Networking", 07 April 2004); and LinuxQuestions ("Multiple Simultaneous VPN Connections?"); and in further view of Official Notice.

Regarding claim 7, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches the VPN client having access to the internal DNS server.

The Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions does not explicitly state registering with the DNS.

An official notice is taken that such use of registering with DNS servers was well known in the art at the time the invention was made by one of ordinary skill in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize any known DNS utilization techniques including registering because it would have enabled practicing the system.

Regarding claim 8, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches wherein the name resolution service comprises one of a DNS and a WINS (ISA01: pgs 1-5).

Regarding claim 9, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system does not teach wherein the virtual host name identifies one of a session of the user or a program used by the user.

An official notice is taken that such use of a virtual hostname to identify the VPN client connection was well known in the art at the time the invention was made by one of ordinary skill in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate virtual hostnames with internal IPs and therefore be capable of identifying the VPN client connection because it would have enabled practicing the system.

Regarding claims 14 and 15, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system does not teach naming the at least one of the plurality of virtual host names with

Art Unit: 2442

a portion of characters representing the user's identity on the network and attaching a suffix identifying the session when the user is concurrently connected.

An official notice is taken that such use of the above hostname naming was well known in the art at the time the invention was made by one of ordinary skill in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use any naming convention of virtual hostnames because it would have enabled practicing the system.

Regarding claims 22-24 and 29-30, these system claims correspond to the method claims 7-9 and 14-15, respectively, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

8. Claims 10-11 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the public use of the products Microsoft Windows 2000/2003 Server, as evidenced by Microsoft01 ("Remote Access VPN Connections", 19 January 2000); in view of the public use of the products ISA Server 2000/2004, as evidenced by ISA01 ("Common DNS Issues in VPN Networking", 07 April 2004); and LinuxQuestions ("Multiple Simultaneous VPN Connections?"); and in further view of VelocityReviews ("Assign Static IP to a VPN user").

Art Unit: 2442

Regarding claim 10, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches resolving host names internal IP addresses in a VPN environment thereby supporting assign hostnames to VPN clients.

The Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system does not teach further comprising the virtual hostname following the first user from the first computer to a second computer and being associated with the second computer.

VelocityReviews, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches assigning VPN users an internal IP from a static IP pool (VelocityReviews: pg 1-5). Thus, if a user ended their VPN session on a first computer and started one on a second computer, they would be assigned the sole internal static IP of the pool. If this internal static had an associated DNS hostname it would resolve back to the user's static IP and for communications with the second computer it would be encapsulated and therefore associated the second computer's public IP (See Microsoft01: pgs 1-2 for fundamental VPN packetizing).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of VelocityReviews for using static IP pools when assigning internal IPs to VPN users. The teachings of VelocityReviews, when implemented in the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to assign VPN users a static internal IP, associated with an internal hostname. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of VelocityReviews in the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system in order to manage VPN users effectively.

Regarding claim 11, this claim contains limitations corresponding to claim 10 for a second user and therefore the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claims 25-26, these system claims correspond to the method claims 10-11, respectively, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

9. Claims 12-13 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the public use of the products Microsoft Windows 2000/2003 Server, as evidenced by Microsoft01 ("Remote Access VPN Connections", 19 January 2000); in view of the public use of the products ISA Server 2000/2004, as evidenced by ISA01 ("Common DNS Issues in VPN Networking", 07 April 2004); LinuxQuestions ("Multiple Simultaneous VPN Connections?"); and VelocityReviews ("Assign Static IP to a VPN user"); and in further view of Pirot et al (US 6,856,676 B1).

Regarding claim 12, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions/VelocityReviews system teaches resolving host names to internal IP addresses, assigned from a static IP pool, in a VPN environment thereby supporting assigning hostnames to VPN clients.

The Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions/VelocityReviews system does not teach further comprising assigning, while the first user accesses the first computer, a third virtual hostname to the first user accessing a second computer

Art Unit: 2442

and associating the third virtual hostname with an IP address of the second computer associated with the first user.

Pirot, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches allowing simultaneous user logins to a VPN from different computers (Pirot: col 11, line 41 – col 12, line 21). Therefore, if a user were to have a static IP pool of multiple internal IPs (VelocityReviews: pgs 1-5), each associated with a internal hostname resolved via an internal DNS server (ISA01: pgs 1-5), the user could start a VPN connection on one computer and receive a first static IP and associated hostname, and, go to a second computer and start a VPN connection and receive a second static IP and associated hostname.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Pirot for allowing and limiting simultaneous VPN connections per user. The teachings of Pirot, when implemented in the above system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to allow and limit a maximum number of simultaneous VPN connections per user. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Pirot in the above system in order to allow users to move from one computer to another and start VPN connections without ending their connection to a reasonable amount.

Regarding claims 27-28, these system claims correspond to the method claims 12-13, respectively, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Bahl (US 7,003,574 B1; US 7,483,992 B2) discloses associating virtual IPs with user session IDs.
- b. The references Microsoft01 and ISA01 have had their citations updated in the attached 892.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2442

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY NICKERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 9:00am - 7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. N./
Jeffrey Nickerson
Examiner, Art Unit 2442

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2442